

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed July 14, 2004, has been carefully reviewed and considered. Claims 1-13 were pending in the present application. By way of the present amendment, claim 14 has been added to further define the present invention. Accordingly, claims 1-14 are pending in the present application. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the reasons that follow.

In the Office Action, claims 1-13 and, allegedly, the specification, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. The Office Action alleges that the claims contain subject matter that has not been described in the specification in a manner sufficient to enable one of skill in the art to practice the claimed invention. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The invention, as claimed, is indeed enabled by the specification. Contrary to the assertion in the Office Action, the specification does not use "computer code unique to the invention" or, for that matter, any computer code at all. Applicant believes the recitation in the specification of the *names* for certain files may be being misinterpreted in the Office Action as *computer code*. The text of the specification and the drawings allow one of ordinary skill in the art to be able to practice the invention recited in the claims of the present application. Accordingly, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 1 and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Bowman-Amuah (U.S. Patent No. 6,697,824) in view of Galich et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,535,591) and Richards (U.S. Patent No. 6,408,303). For at least the reasons set forth herein, this rejection is overcome.

The Office Action correctly asserts, on page 3, that Bowman-Amuah does not disclose various elements of the claimed invention, such as: retrieving a template associated with the inbound document; reading the template to determine what data is to be extracted from the inbound document and extracting said data; and creating a profile record for the trading partner in the

profile database and populating said profile record with said extracted data. These claim elements are recited in both of the independent claims 1 and 11 from which the remaining claims in the present application depend.

The Office Action then asserts that Galich et al. disclose the above recited features of the claims. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Galich et al. describes a system where the client is asked to choose a profile that best represents the client and is then asked a series of questions based on the selected profile. This does not disclose, teach or suggest the afore-mentioned elements of the claimed invention. Specifically, there is no disclosure, teaching or suggestion in Galich et al. of retrieving a template associated with an *inbound document*. It does not disclose, teach or suggest determining what data is to be extracted from an inbound document much less extracting such data and populating a profile record of a trading partner with such data. For at least these reasons, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of claims 1 and 13 should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 2-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable in view of the rejection as applied to claim 1 in further view of various combinations of additional references. Claims 2-10 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1, claim 11 contains the same elements as claim 1 described above and claim 12 depends from claim 11. Accordingly, in view of the patentability of claim 1 over the combination of Bowman-Amuah, Galich et al. and Richards as set forth above, the rejection of claims 2-12 should also be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 14 has been added to further define the invention and is believed to be patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date

SEPTEMBER 28, 2004



Ankur D. Shah
Registration No. 41,514

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Washington Harbour
3000 K Street, N.W., Suite 500
Washington, D.C. 20007-5143
Telephone: (202) 672-5300
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399